

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/988,494                                     | 11/20/2001  | Tianmci Ouyang       | LIFE040                 | 8555             |
| 7590 04/16/2004                                |             | EXAMINER             |                         |                  |
| Bret E. Field Bozicevic, Field and Francis LLP |             |                      | DAVIS, RUTH A           |                  |
|  |             |                      |                         |                  |
| Suite 200                                      |             |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| 200 Middlefiel                                 | ld Road .   | 1651                 |                         |                  |
| Menlo Park, CA 94025                           |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 04/16/2004 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.                   | Applicant(s)           |  |  |  |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/988,494                        | OUYANG ET AL.          |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action   | Examiner                          | Art Unit               |  |  |  |
|   | Ruth A. Davis                     | 1651                   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence address |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 17 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 3/17/04. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| (a) Mathey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| (b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| 7. ☑ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☑ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10 and 33-42</u> .  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| 8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
|   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
|   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |
|   |                                   |                        |  |  |  |

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment requires a ratio of flavin to an unnamed ingredient in claims 1 and 33. Specifically, the proposed amendment fails to set forth to what the flavin is in a ratio with.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: while applicant argues the composition has unexpected results of increased stability, the figures to which applicant refers are not commensurate in scope with the claimed composition. Specifically, the figures show a composition of FAD and/or borax, not boric acid or borate; and the independent claims do not require borax. In addition, the claims do not require how much of the flavin or group III compound must be present to stabilize the composition. Finally, the figures on which applicant relies do not reflect the specific ratios or amounts ar argued by applicant. Moreover, the arguments are not commensurate is scope with the claims or figures. Regarding claims 35, 37 and 39. these claims stand rejected under 103 for the reasons set for the in the final rejection.

EOM B. LANKFORD, JI